DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 126 665 EC 090 951

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Shea, Thomas M.; And Others |
| TITLE | Special Education Microteaching Clinic: Final Report. |
| INSTITUTION | Southern Illinois Univ., Edwardsville. |
| SPONS AGENCY | Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. |
| REPORT NO | 020333 |
| PUB DATE | Oct 74 |
| GRANT | OEG-0-71-3732 |
| NOTE | 52p.; For related information, see EC 090 952 |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage. |
| DESCRIPTORS | Classroom Observation Techniques; Exceptional Child Education; Feedback; *Handicapped Children; Higher Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Microteaching; Program Evaluation; *Special Education Teachers; *Student Teaching; *Teacher Education; Teacher Evaluation; *Video Tape Recordings |
| IDENTIFIERS | *Special Education Microteaching Clinic |

ABSTRACT

Presented is the final report on the Special Education Microteaching Clinic at Southern Illinois University (Edwardsville) which incorporates a practice teaching technique in which a student teaches a lesson, is critiqued and shown a videotape, then reteaches the lesson. Section I, the overview, includes a presentation of the Microteaching Clinic's purpose, objectives, and activities as originally proposed; and outlines the program's three phases--the training phase (which includes training special education department faculty and developing modeling tapes), application of the teach-reteach microteaching cycle, and evaluation of the prototype (including internal or microlesson evaluation, short term program evaluation, and long term program evaluation). A 3-year summary, Section II, covers such program activities as clinic staff and faculty training, modeling videotape production, application of microteaching at the university, project evaluation procedures and activities, personnel considerations, and dissemination activities. The final section deals with the analysis of data gathered in five areas of evaluation: the effect of viewing the modeling video tape prior to microteaching on trainee performance, trainees' evaluation of microteaching, teaching behavior of student-teachers who were assigned to microteaching during their training program, an opinionnaire survey of former microteaching trainees, and field testing the preliminary lesson modules. Noted among findings is that there is a slight instructional advantage in having a trainee view a modeling tape prior to teaching a lesson. (SB)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED126665

# Special Education Microteaching Clinic
# Southern Illinois University
# Edwardsville, Illinois

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

## Final Report

submitted by

Thomas M. Shea - Co-Investigator

William R. Whiteside - Co-Investigator

Emmet G. Beetner - Coordinator

Don L. Lindsey - Assistant Coordinator

October 31, 1974
USOE 020533 Special Project Number

EC090951

This report and the enclosed training materials are concerned with activities of the Southern Illinois University (Edwardsville) Special Education Microteaching Clinic. This project was operated from August 1971 to August 1974 with funds provided by the United States Office of Education (Special Project Number 020533).

This Final Report includes:

I. Project Overview

II. A Three-Year Summary of Project Activities

III. Statistical Analysis of Evaluation Data

The First section, the overview, includes a presentation of the Microteaching Clinic's purpose, objectives, and activities as originally proposed by the investigators in September, 1970.

In section Two of the report, the activities actually engaged in by the staff to attain the originally proposed objectives are presented and discussed. The reader will note that several of the original proposals were modified or abandoned during the three-year period to increase overall project effectiveness. In various topical areas when additional information on the specific topic is available among project publications reference is made to the appropriate sources.

In the final section, a statistical analysis of project evaluation data is presented. We have noted those research questions which originally proposed were abandoned as unworkable during the three-year period.

# PROJECT OVERVIEW

## Section I

Microteaching can be defined in broad terms as a practice teaching technique in which a student teaches a lesson, is critiqued, then re-teaches the lesson. The name "microteaching" derives from the fact that the lesson content, the duration of the lesson, and the number of learners involved are reduced considerably in relation to traditional practice teaching dimensions. Another characteristic of microteaching is the video-taping of the lesson, which provides almost immediate feedback for the trainee and the critiquer.

Since its inception more than 10 years ago, microteaching has gained considerably in popularity. J. A. Johnson (1968) in a national survey of teacher-training programs, reported that approximately 53 percent of the programs used microteaching to some degree. Actually this concept has had several variations of application to teacher training programs. The micro-teaching clinic at Stanford University, for example, focuses upon three patterns of utilization: (1) a five-minute micro lesson used to practice single teaching skills, (2) a twenty-minute lesson which is group-planned and performed, and (3) research clinical sessions to test new training pro-tocols. At San Jose State College the emphasis is on training pre-service elementary teachers in the general skills of interaction with students via microteaching.

School districts have also applied microteaching in inservice train-ing programs. As Allen and Ryan have pointed out, microteaching is readily adapt ble to the in-service training of inexperienced teachers. The Jefferson County (Colorado) School District in cooperation with Colorado College, sponsors just such a program.

However, there are no programs in which microteaching has been systematically applied with Special Education trainees as an integral part of a comprehensive training program. The Special Education Microteaching Clinic is designed to fill this void.

At Southern Illinois University (Edwardsville) a microteaching laboratory has been in existence for five years, with the major emphasis on the training of secondary school student-teachers.*

The main purpose of this overview is to describe the Special Education Microteaching Clinic at Southern Illinois University (Edwardsville). This Clinic, funded in the Spring of 1971, was designed primarily to provide pre-service and in-service teachers enrolled in the Special Education course at the University with training and practice in the application of a variety of technical teaching skills, in the affective, cognitive, and psychomotor learning domains.

To attain this objective the Microteaching Clinic (1) would provide training in the application of currently identified skill components of Special Education teaching, and (2) conduct research designed to identify new skill components leading to the production of microteaching lessons to transmit these skills to teacher-trainees.

The program includes four overlapping phases which would be conducted concurrently. These phases were:

training a Microteaching Clinic staff,

producing modeling tapes of presently identified and/or readily identifiable teaching skill components,

*Note: Throughout this report the word "Laboratory" refers to the University Microteaching Laboratory which emphasizes the training of Secondary School teachers; "Clinic" refers to the Special Education Microteaching Clinic which is the subject of this report.

applying the teach-reteach microteaching procedures in several core training courses offered as a part of the overall Special Education training program at the University, and

conducting short and long term evaluation of the effectiveness of both microteaching procedure and the clinic operation.

TRAINING PHASE

To operate an efficient Microteaching Clinic, several levels of staff would be required:

training Special Education Department faculty in the techniques of Microteaching,

training Microteaching Laboratory staff in the characteristics and problems of exceptional children and teaching techniques applied in the education of exceptional children, and

training microteaching critiquers.

Training Special Education Department Faculty. Several members of the Special Education Department's faculty had previous experience in microteaching and were actively involved at the University Microteaching Laboratory. However, in an effort to develop a cohesive understanding of the microteaching concept to be applied at the clinic, each faculty member participated in a seminar presented by the staff of the Laboratory and their consultants.

This Seminar included discussion of the following topics:

The concept of microteaching.

The purpose of the Microteaching Laboratory.

Microteaching as a supplement to present professional training programs.

The Workshop focused on the four interrelated issues (Allen and Ryan, 1969):

- the component-skills approach,
- the rationale and benefits of focusing on discrete skills,
- strategies and techniques of supervision, and
- the Clinic's purpose, objectives, and curriculum.

This Workshop would be conducted jointly by the faculty of the Special Education Department and the Staff of the Clinic and Laboratory. The Workshop also included a discussion of the issues enumerated above as they relate to exceptional children and teachers of exceptional children.

Critiquers participated in both microteaching and critiquing during the training program. Critiquers' training would be continued throughout the academic year by means of weekly three-hour staff seminars devoted to relevant problems and issues.

Modeling Tapes

There were three potential sources of modeling tapes for application in Special Education Microteaching Clinic: (a) modeling tapes demonstrating identified teaching skills and available at the Laboratory, (b) modeling tapes specifically for the demonstration of Special Education teaching techniques which were identified but not produced and (c) those skills which were neither identified nor produced.

a. Those modeling tapes available at the University Microteaching Laboratory and germane to the purposes of the Clinic would be duplicated and utilized in the instructional program.

b. Modeling tapes of identified and identifiable Special Education teaching techniques would be produced as follows:

(1) the teaching skill to be modeled would be clearly defined by the Clinic staff and faculty.

(2) the skill would be integrated into a short lesson and presented by the demonstration teacher, experienced graduate students or a local teacher having expertise in this skill

(3) the resulting tape would be viewed, discussed and evaluated by the staff and teacher to determine it's acceptability,

(4) the modified lesson would be taped and discussed .

(5) This tape-view-discuss-evaluate procedure would be repeated until an acceptable modeling tape was produced for use in the training program.

c. Modeling tapes as of yet unidentified Special Education teaching techniques would be developed in the following manner:

(1) a graduate student or local teacher would be invited to participate in all-day research taping sessions either on the University campus, at an off-campus taping facility, or in a local public or private school classroom.

(2) The entire school day would be taped as unobtrusively as feasible.

(3) Tapes of these sessions would systematically viewed, and evaluated by staff and critiquers to identify the technical teaching skills used by the teacher.

(4) As new teaching skills were identified, a demonstration teacher would be invited to produce preliminary modeling tapes in which he applied the "newly" identified teaching skill.

APPLICATION OF THE TEACH-RETEACH MICROTEACHING CYCLE

During the teach-reteach cycle a 12 to 25 minute microlesson coordinated with a skill being emphasized in the core course is performed by the trainee.

A. Trainee views a modeling tape of the skill to be performed.

B. Trainee is provided an opportunity to receive verbal and/or written instructions and seek clarifications from the critiquer.

C. Trainee is scheduled for two 60 minute teach-reteach cycles at the Clinic (either on-or off-campus each week).

D. Trainee teaches the lesson including the prescribed skill to 4 or 5 learners (children or peers).

E. Critiquer observes the lesson and evaluates the trainee's technical skill. The peer-learners rate the lesson. Critiquer and trainee view the video tape of lesson and discuss trainee's performance. This critique period is 10 to 25 minutes in duration.

F. After the critique, trainee has a 15-minute work period during which he is to recast his lessons incorporating suggestions from the critique.

G. After this planning period, the trainee reteaches the lesson to a new group of students.

H. The lesson is again discussed with the critiquer.

On another day during the week or the following week the student returns to the Clinic for another 60-minute cycle of teach, critique, planning, reteach, and recritique. During this second and subsequent sessions the trainee develops and teaches a different lesson, employing a different skill, if he has successfully performed the original lesson. If he has not successfully performed the original lesson it is repeated at this time.

The Special Education Microteaching Clinic will consist of on-campus and off-campus facilities. On-campus facilities are used for teach-reteach cycle (Phase A); off-campus facilities are used for teach-reteach cycle (Phase B).

Phase A, conducted at the on-campus Special Education Microteaching Clinic, consists of the previously described teach-reteach cycle. During this phase the student-trainee presents lessons to his peers. This phase is coordinated with core courses 410a, Problems and Characteristics of the Emotionally Disturbed Child; 410b, Problems and Characteristics of the Mentally Retarded; 410f, Problems and Characteristics of the Socially Maladjusted Child; 410g, Problems and Characteristics of the Learning Disabled Child; and 430, Behavior Modification in Special Education.

Phase B, conducted at off-campus Special Education Microteaching Stations, consists of the previously described teach-reteach cycle. During Phase B, the student-trainee presents micro-lessons to exceptional

children enrolled in special education programs from the local public schools. The facilities available will include; Special Education Center (SEC-SIUEO, and special classes in the Metro-East Special Education Districts. This phase is coordinated with core courses 411, Assessment and Remediation of Learning Disabilities; 420a, Methods and Materials for Children With Learning and/or Behavioral Problems; 420b, Methods and Materials in the Education of the Educable Mentally Handicapped.

EVALUATION OF PROTOTYPE

The project staff would be responsible for both internal and external evaluation of the Clinic.

Internal or Microlesson Evaluation.

(1) Observable skill performance criteria will be established by the staff for each technical teaching skill (or lesson) included included in the training program.

(2) The trainee's performance is evaluated in relation to the criteria for acceptable performance of the specific microlesson. Specifically internal evaluation is related to quantifying the trainee's skill performance, i.e., can he do that which the lesson is designed to train him to do. For example, a series of microlessons may have the following behavioral objective:

> The trainee during the microlesson will apply the technical teaching skill of consistently reinforcing the task-oriented behavior manifest by the learner. The criteria for acceptable performance is trainee reinforcement via verbal and non-verbal cues a minimum of 50% of the task-oriented behavior manifest by the learner.

In this manner the essence of the microteaching program, i.e., training in technical teaching skill, can be observed, objectified, and quantified.

(3) Further internal evaluation of the components of the program would be conducted via the variations in the application of modeling tapes, verbal instructions and written protocols, or all of these variables. A pre-test of the trainees effectiveness in a particular teaching skill is measured as he presents a micro-lesson prior to exposure to a modeling tape, and/or written protocol, and/or verbal instructions. By manipulating these variables the staff can evaluate the relative power of the various teach-reteach cycle components.

Short Term Program Evaluation. During the three years of the Clinic's operation, under Special Project funds, all students enrolled in the core courses will participate in the project. They will be grouped as follows:

- 50% of the students will attend four hours lecture-discussion and four hours microteaching per week during each academic quarter they are enrolled in a core course.
- 50% of the students will attend four hours lecture-discussion and four hours special class participation with weekly seminar during each academic quarter they are enrolled in a core course.

Trainees near the termination of the training sequence participate in student-teaching in local special classes. As a part of their dual role the microteaching critiquers will evaluate student-teachers in their field placements. In this role, and applying a pre-planned observation schedule,

the critiquers objectively evaluate the technical teaching skills of each trainee which correlate with the microteaching lessons. Critiquers should not be assigned as field supervisors for trainees they critiqued in the Clinic.

Long Term Program Evaluation. Approximately 80% of the teachers trained at SIUE remain in the Metro-East area of Illinois after graduation. The majority are located within a twenty-five mile radius of the University. During the second and subsequent years of the project, all trainees will be observed and evaluated in their professional placements relative to the utilization of the technical teaching skills. This procedure will provide data relative to the long term applicability of microteaching.

# A THREE-YEAR SUMMARY

# of

# PROJECT ACTIVITIES

Section II

This three-year summary of project activities provides the reader with a comprehensive overview of the Special Education Microteaching Project, exclusive of the statistical analysis reported in Section III of this document and the specific procedural information presented in the publication, Special Education Microteaching which is attached hereto.

In this Section consideration is given to:

A. Clinic staff and faculty training activities,

B. Modeling videotape production,

C. Application of Microteaching at the University

D. Project evaluation procedures and activities,

E. Personnel considerations, and

F. Dissemination activities.

An effort has been made to key each topic discussed in this Section to other Sections of this Report and/or the previously mentioned publication (Special Education Microteaching) when additional information on the topic is available in that source. References, such as, "Section I" or Section III, are references to parts of this report. References, such as, "Manual, page 2" or "Manual, page 30", are references to the publication entitled, Special Education Microteaching which is enclosed.

A. Clinic Staff and Faculty Training Activities.

1. Each Fall a training seminar was conducted for the Faculty of the Special Education Department for the purposes of orienting new faculty to the project and familiarizing all the faculty members with the project developments during the previous year. (See Section I and Manual, p.15-18)
2. Each Fall a 30-hour workshop was conducted for microteaching critiquers who would be employed by the Clinic. If a new critiquer joined the staff during the year a condensed version of this workshop was provided for him. (See Section I and Manual, p.15-18)
3. Weekly and biweekly seminars were conducted for the purpose of inservice training for critiquers throughout the duration of the project. These discussions focused on current microteaching problems and issues.

B. Modeling Videotape Production.

1. In the original proposal for this project the investigators called for the incorporation into the Special Education Clinic Program of model tapes produced by the Secondary Education Department at the University and available in the Microteaching Laboratory. Upon review, these tapes proved to be inappropriate to the purposes of the Special Education Clinic. This objective was abandoned.
2. During the three-year period 78 instructional modules (videotapes and written protocols) were produced by the staff of

the Clinic. Of this number, twenty were prepared and distributed nationally. The twenty lessons are described in the Manual on pages 47-50. The remaining 58 modules were not distributed for one or more of the following reasons: (1) the skill being demonstrated was of interest to only a small audience, (2) field testing of the module demonstrated that major revision would be necessary if it were to be distributed, (3) the skill being demonstrated was so ill-defined in the literature that it was impossible to objectify the methodology for production purposes, (4) the skill was of a nature that it's substance could not be produced on videotape, (5) adequate development of the skill was not technically feasible with the production equipment available, or (6) adequate production of the lesson was not financially feasible.

3. Production procedures for modeling videotapes, protocols and evaluation instruments are described in the Manual pages 21-35.

4. Special Education classrooms were observed and video taped to identify successful teaching skills which had previously been unidentified. Approximately 84 hours of video tape was produced during the three-year period in an effort to realize this research objective. These video tapes include three hours observation of 28 special classes.

   This objective was abandoned after the responsible faculty and staff members agreed that their analysis of the tapes was not productive relative to the identification of previously unidentified teaching skills.

C. Application of Microteaching at the University.

A total of 757 trainees engaged in microteaching during the three-year period. This is approximately 75.7 trainees per academic quarter. Of these, 544 trainees were served in the On-Campus Clinic in conjunction with core courses 410a, 410b, 410f, 410g and 430. The remaining 213 trainees were served in Off-Campus Clinics in local schools. Their training was in conjunction with the core courses numbered 411, 420a, and 420b. The Off-Campus Clinics were located in the following Illinois schools;

Caseyville School, Collinsville
Lincoln School, Collinsville
Central Elementary School, Roxana
Signal Hill School, Signal Hill
William Holliday School, Belleville
Columbus School, Edwardsville
Nelson School, Edwardsville
Senior High School, Edwardsville
LeClaire School, Edwardsville
Golden Gardens School, East St. Louis
Johnson School, East St. Louis
South Roxana Elementary School, South Roxana

Microteaching procedures applied in the clinics are discussed, in detail, in Section I and the Manual, pp. 5-17.

D. Project Evaluation Procedures and Activities

1. Evaluation of the Microteaching project took several forms.

A statistical analysis of the effectiveness of clinic procedures

and the results of field testing efforts are presented in Section III. It should be noted that several of the original research questions were abandoned during the three-year period.

2. In addition to the evaluations procedures discussed in the paragraph above an extensive internal evaluation of Clinic operations was conducted by Emmet G. Beetner in November, 1972. This was prior to Mr. Beetner's tenure as Project Coordinator. Another evaluation of the Clinic was conducted by James D. Strauch, PhD, of the University of Connecticut in February, 1974.

E. Personnel Considerations:

The Coordinator of the Clinic from June, 1971 to June, 1973 was Dr. Richard N. Jensen. Emmet G. Beetner was Assistant Coordinator from June, 1972 to June, 1973. From June, 1973 to August, 1974 Mr. Beetner was Coordinator of the Clinic and Don L. Lindsey, Assistant Coordinator.

A complete listing of the personnel employed in the Project is presented below. It should be noted that the staff consisted primarily of graduate teaching assistants whose average tenure with the Project was approximately nine months.

## CO-INVESTIGATORS

William R. Whiteside, Ph.D. and Thomas M. Shea, Ed.D.

| COORDINATOR | ASSISTANT COORDINATOR |
|---|---|
| Emmet G. Beetner, M.A. | Don L. Lindsey, M.S. |

## STAFF

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Carol Alstat | Linda Finley | Judy Klingsick | Ruth O'Connell |
| Jim Bailey | Mart Fogle | Elizabeth Komlos | Sharon Packard |
| Judy Buchta | Linda Geifer | Mary Kraus | Velma Parker |
| Jerry Chen | Saralee Grammer | Emily Krohn | Ronald Schaefer |
| Audrey Cross | Carole Gunter | Don Lindsey | Linda K. Spence |
| Cynthia DeHart | Linda Gurr | Richard Marxer | Gabrielle Ventucci |
| James Dodds | Edward Hiser | Bob Metcalf | John Wigger |
| Dennis Dorsey | W. Joy Jones | Michelle Murray | Wayne Wiseman |
| Constance Duane | Virginia Keehner | Brian Newlands | Mary Zanger |

## SPECIAL EDUCATION FACULTY

Emmet G. Beetner, M.A.
Rosemary W. Egan, M.S.
Daniel Ferritor, Ph.D.
Anita M. Foxworth, Ph.D.
Sajjad Haider, Ph.D.
Richard N. Jensen, Ph.D.*
Barbara K. Leardi, B.S.
Don L. Lindsey, M.S.
Ruby D. Long, Ed.D.
V. Faye Shaffer, Ed.D.
Thomas M. Shea, Ed.D.
Patricia J. Sims, M.S.
Jerome L. Stultz, M.S.
Mark M. Tucker, Ed.D.
Robert M. Wagner, Ph.D.
James E. Walker, Ph.D.
William R. Whiteside, Ph.D.
Sandra L. Wilson, B.S.
Elizabeth Ziegler, M.S.

* Project Co-Ordinator 1971-1973.

F. Dissemination Activities.

1. Several News Releases, including a film clip and photographs of Clinic activities, were made available to local, state and regional mass media through the University News Service. These were presented in several local and state (Illinois and Missouri) newspapers and on several television channels.
2. Fifteen hundred descriptive brochures of the Clinic program were printed and distributed, (1) via mail, to all Special Education Training programs in the United States and (2) at various state, regional and national professional meetings and conventions.
3. Formal presentations were made at:
   a. 1972 - Illinois Council for Exceptional Children Convention, Chicago.
   b. 1973 - Illinois Council for Exceptional Children Convention, Chicago.
   c. October 1971 - BEH-BEPD Project Directors' Conference, Washington, D.C.
   d. March 1972 - Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders Conference, Washington, D.C.
   e. 1975- Convention of the Council for Exceptional Children, Los Angeles, California
4. Invitational Workshop on Microteaching was conducted for Special Education Administrators and teacher trainees from throughout the United States in Edwardsville, Illinois during November 1972.

5. An Article on the Microteaching Project was published in the Illinois Journal of Education in 1972 by R. N. Jensen, Clinic Coordinator.

6. The publication, Special Education Microteaching was distributed via mail to all Special Education Departments listed in the 1972 U.S.O.E. publication entitled, Scholarship Program, Education of Handicapped Children. This includes approximately 400 training centers.

7. Seventeen complete sets of the twenty modules were published and distributed to various resource centers throughout the United States. Each module distributed is a self-contained unit including a Manual of Instructions, a lesson protocol, a lesson evaluation instrument and a video tape.

   Sets of modules were distributed to the Area Learning Resource Centers listed below with the Assistance of Hubert D. Summers, Assistant Director, Media, Materials and Technology Services, The Ohio State University, Columbus.

| ALRC #1 | States Served: |
|---|---|
| Area Learning Resource Center #1<br>Clinical Services Building, 3rd fl.<br>University of Oregon<br>Eugene, Oregon 97403<br>Project Director: Dr. Wayne Lance | Alaska, Hawaii, Samoa, Guam, Trust Territory, Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming |
| **ALRC #2** | |
| Area Learning Resource Center #2<br>1031 South Broadway, Suite 623<br>Los Angeles, California 90015<br>Project Director: Mr. Charles A. Watts | California |

| ALRC #3 | States Served: |
|---|---|
| Area Learning Resource Center #3<br>New Mexico State University<br>Box 3AW<br>Las Cruces, New Mexico 88003<br>Project Director: Dr. Jonathan J. Curtis (Acting) | Nevada, Utah, Colorado, Arizona, New Mexico, and BIA Schools |
| **ALRC #4** | |
| Area Learning Resource Center #4<br>114 Second Avenue<br>Coralville, Iowa 52241<br>Project Director: Kay F. Kramer | North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, Iowa, Missouri, and Arkansas |
| **ALRC #5** | |
| Area Learning Resource Center #5<br>Texas Education Agency<br>201 East 11th Street<br>Austin, Texas 78701 | Texas |
| **ALRC #6** | |
| Great Lakes Area Learning Resource Center<br>P.O. Box 420<br>Michigan Department of Education<br>Lansing, Michigan 48902<br>Project Director: Mr. Theodore Beck | Minnesota, Wisconsin Michigan, and Indiana |
| **ALRC #7** | |
| Area Learning Resource Center #7<br>1020 South Spring Street<br>Springfield, Illinois 62706<br>Project Director: Ms. Gloria Calovini | Illinois |
| **ALRC #8** | |
| Area Learning Resource Center #8<br>Ohio Division of Special Education<br>933 High Street<br>Worthington, Ohio 43085<br>Project Director: Mr. Joe Todd | Ohio |
| **ALRC #9** | |
| Area Learning Resource Center #9<br>New Jersey State Department of Education<br>225 West Street<br>Trenton, New Jersey 08625<br>Project Director: Dr. Nicholas Maldari | Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and New Jersey |

ALRC #10 — States Served:

New York State Area Learning Resource Center, New York State Education Department, Division for Handicapped Children
55 Elk Street
Albany, New York 12224
Project Director: Dr. Joseph Iraci

States Served: New York

ALRC #11

Area Learning Resource Center #11
443 South Gulph Road
King of Prussia, Pennsylvania 19406
Project Director: Dr. William Streissguth

Pennsylvania

ALRC #12

Area Learning Resource Center #12
University of Kentucky
7301 South Limestone Street
Lexington, Kentucky 40506
Project Director: Mr. Robert L. Sterrett

Delaware, D.C., Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, North Carolina, Puerto Rico, and Virgin Islands

Specialized Office #4

Audio Visual Center
Indiana University
2805 East 10th Street
Bloomington, Indiana 47401
Project Director: E. L. Richardson

ALRC #13

Area Learning Resource Center #13
(tentative address)
Ohio State University
220 West 12th Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43210
Mr. Hubert D. Summers, Assistant Director
Media, Materials, and Technology Services

In addition sets of modules were sent to those persons assisting in project field testing and evaluation activities. These include:

Dr. Thomas M. Stephens
Faculty for Exceptional Children
College of Education
356 Arps Hall
Ohio State University
1945 North High Street
Columbus,,Ohio 43210

Dr. Stanley Urban
Special Education Services/Instruction
Glassboro State College
Glassboro, New Jersey 08208

Dr. James D. Strauch
Department of Guidance, Educational Psychology
and Special Education
University of Connecticut
Storrs, Connecticut

# STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

# of

# EVALUATION DATA

Section III

This section of the report deals with the analysis of data gathered through use of the various evaluation instruments. There are five areas of evaluation: The effect of viewing the modeling video tape prior to Microteaching on trainee performance, Trainees' evaluation of Microteaching, Teaching behavior of student-teachers who were assigned to Microteaching during their training program, An opinionnaire survey of former Microteaching trainees, and Field testing the preliminary lesson modules.

I. The Effect of Viewing a Modeling Tape on Microteaching Performance.

Seven hundred-fifty-seven trainees in special education were assigned to Microteaching during the three-year period. Table I presents a breakdown by Academic Quarters. Each trainee who was assigned to Microteaching was assigned to one of two experimental groups: MT or NMT. Trainees in the MT group were shown a modeling tape prior to their performance of each Microteaching lesson. Trainees in the NMT group were not shown a tape prior to each lesson. The remainder of the Microteaching experience was constant for both MT and NMT groups, consisting of the instructional procedure described in Section I. The dependent variable was the trainee's initial teach score as recorded by the critiquer. The trainee was rated on a variety of items specifically designed for the evaluation of his performance on that lesson.

The rating scale used for each item was as follows:

1 - Did not perform task.

2 - Performed but was obviously unprepared and/or incompetent.

3 - Performed with average competence (as compared with other trainees).

4 - Performed with professional competence (as in the model tape).

Items which were logically not amenable to rating, such as "Shows object to be learned to student:" were rated "1" if the trainee did not perform the task and "4" if he did perform the task. Criterion performance was arbitrarily set at 80% of total possible score. Those who did not achieve criterion, repeated the lesson. Students in the NMT group were shown modeling tapes after their initial performance if they were required to reteach.

This procedure was used in both the on-campus and off-campus settings.

RESULTS: Since a different checklist was used for each lesson; each lesson may be regarded as an individual experiment, and data are so presented. The results of on-campus and off-campus lessons are presented separately for reading convenience.

Because this project was carried out with materials in the process of being developed rather than fully developed materials; there were as many as three different checklists used at various times with a single lesson. Where the checklists were incompatible the results are listed separately. Otherwise, data has been compressed across academic quarters.

In the following tables abbreviations of lesson titles are used:

| Lesson Title | Abbreviation |
|---|---|
| Adaptive Behavior of the Mentally retarded | Adaptive |
| Administering the Informal Reading-Inventory | IRI |
| Barsch Movegenics Method: Body Awareness | Barsch |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Behavior Modification: Selecting Reinforcers | --- | Selecting |
| Behavior Modification: Token Reinforcement | --- | Token |
| Contingency Contracting | --- | Con-Con |
| Counting and Charting Behaviors | --- | Counting |
| Cruickshank-Auditory Discrimination | --- | Cruickshank |
| Development of Sight Association | --- | Sight |
| DISTAR Reading: Symbol-Action | --- | DISTAR |
| Experiential Approach to Developing Language Skills | --- | Experiential |
| Fernald's Hand-Kinesthetic Method of Teaching Reading | --- | Fernald |
| Frostig Developmental Test of Visual Perception | --- | Frostig |
| Gillingham-Stillman Method of Teaching Reading | --- | Gill-Still |
| ITPA Visual Remediation Techniques | --- | ITPA |
| Interview Model for the Itinerant Teacher and the Classroom Teacher | --- | Itinerant |
| Life-Space Interview: "Reality Rub-In" | --- | Life-Space |
| Management of Aggression in the Classroom | --- | Management |
| Modifying Behavior in the Classroom: Ignoring and Reinforcing Behavior | --- | Ignoring |
| Peabody Language Development Kit | --- | Peabody |
| Perceptual Training: Kephart | --- | Kephart |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Pitman's Initial Teaching Alphabet | --- | Pitman |
| Psychosituational Interview Strategy | --- | Psychosit. |
| Purdue Perceptual-Motor Survey: Chalkboard | --- | Purdue |
| Success Programming | --- | Success |
| Teacher-Parent Interview: Down's Syndrome | --- | Down's |
| Teacher's Role in the Staffing of a Learning Disabled Child | --- | Staffing |
| Creative Teaching: Development of Concepts | --- | Creative |
| Wepman Test of Auditory Discrimination | --- | Wepman |
| Words Associated with Activities of Daily Vocabulary | --- | Words |

Table I Number of trainees assigned to Microteaching by Quarter

| | On-Campus | Off-Campus | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Winter, 1972 | 47 | 18 | 65 |
| Spring, 1972 | 45 | 21 | 66 |
| Summer, 1972 | 39 | 0 | 39 |
| Fall, 1972 | 45 | 48 | 93 |
| Winter, 1973 | 67 | 37 | 104 |
| Spring, 1973 | 52 | 18 | 70 |
| Summer, 1973 | 41 | 31 | 72 |
| Fall, 1973 | 60 | 22 | 82 |
| Winter, 1974 | 60 | 18 | 78 |
| Spring, 1974 | 88 | -- | 88 |
| | 544 | 213 | 757 |

Table II Comparison of initial mean scores of trainees assigned to MT and NMT groups: Off-Campus. N= 213

| Lesson | Total Possible | MT $\bar{X}$ | MT n | NMT $\bar{X}$ | NMT n |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Barsch | 44 | 38.40 | 15 | 37.56 | 23 |
| Creative | 32 | 33.47 | 17 | 33.91 | 24 |
| Cruickshank | 48 | 35.97 | 29 | 46.67 | 28 |
| Cruickshank | 52 | 49.54 | 11 | 49.40 | 15 |
| DISTAR | 36 | 33.69 | 13 | 33.66 | 3 |
| Doman | 24 | 22.50 | 4 | 20.50 | 4 |
| Experiential | 40 | 36.42 | 7 | 37.00 | 2 |
| Fernald | 40 | 35.97 | 37 | 34.90 | 21 |
| Frostig | 32 | 29.20 | 30 | 29.17 | 45 |
| Geist | 20 | 18.80 | 5 | 18.66 | 9 |
| Gill-Still | 44 | 41.48 | 31 | 40.95 | 20 |
| IRI | 40 | 37.93 | 15 | 36.33 | 33 |
| ITPA | 44 | 41.10 | 37 | 41.84 | 39 |
| Kephart | 28 | 27.40 | 15 | 25.53 | 13 * |
| Laterality | 32 | 30.70 | 10 | 29.07 | 14 * |
| Life-Space | 40 | 38.15 | 13 | 39.87 | 9 * |
| Peabody | 36 | 34.63 | 47 | 33.57 | 42 |
| Pitman | 32 | 30.23 | 26 | 30.15 | 19 |
| Purdue | 36 | 34.17 | 35 | 34.09 | 51 |
| Sight | 56 | 50.88 | 9 | 52.66 | 15 |
| Sullivan | 44 | 42.84 | 13 | 42.44 | 9 |

Table II
Continued

| Lesson | Total Possible | MT $\bar{X}$ | MT n | NMT $\bar{X}$ | NMT n |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Token | 24 | 37.93 | 9 | 22.84 | 13 * |
| Wepman | 40 | 37.26 | 19 | 37.09 | 21 |
| Wepman | 32 | 30.15 | 13 | 30.60 | 25 |
| Words | 28 | 27.50 | 8 | 27.40 | 5 |

* Difference in means significant at the .05 level

Table III Comparison of initial mean scores of trainees assigned to MT and NMT groups: On-Campus. N= 544

| Lesson | Total Possible | MT $\bar{X}$ | MT n | NMT $\bar{X}$ | NMT n |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Adaptive | 36 | 34.76 | 51 | 34.18 | 38 |
| Barsch | 44 | 41.71 | 52 | 39.45 | 24 |
| ConCon | 36 | 33.54 | 75 | 32.55 | 80 |
| ConCon | 40 | 38.46 | 32 | 39.00 | 16 |
| ConCon | 36 | 33.54 | 75 | 32.55 | 80 |
| Counting | 24 | 22.59 | 99 | 22.60 | 76 |
| Creative | 32 | 31.30 | 10 | 30.22 | 9 |
| Cruickshank | 48 | 46.50 | 6 | 42.85 | 7 |
| Cruickshank | 56 | 55.50 | 12 | | |
| DISTAR | 36 | 33.21 | 84 | 33.91 | 45 |
| Doman | 24 | 22.03 | 62 | 21.11 | 34 |
| Down's | 36 | 34.20 | 48 | 34.20 | 30 |
| Experiential | 40 | 37.66 | 27 | 36.66 | 48 |
| Fernald | 40 | 35.37 | 27 | 33.75 | 26 |
| Fernald | 56 | 51.60 | 28 | | |
| Frostig | 32 | 29.07 | 13 | 30.25 | 4 |
| Frostig | 48 | | | 48.00 | 2 |
| Geist | 20 | 19.80 | 5 | | |
| Getman | 40 | 38.13 | 65 | 36.80 | 40 * |
| Gill-Still | 44 | 40.12 | 8 | 40.25 | 4 |
| Gill-Still | 96 | 93.46 | 15 | | |
| Ignoring | 40 | 35.96 | 89 | 35.19 | 81 |

Table III
Continued

| Lesson | Total Possible | MT $\bar{X}$ | MT n | NMT $\bar{X}$ | NMT n |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ignoring | 44 | 38.59 | 27 | 39.20 | 5 |
| IRI | 40 | 35.00 | 11 | 37.20 | 5 |
| Itinerent | 32 | 28.91 | 72 | 27.94 | 56 |
| Itinerent | 36 | 31.42 | 14 | 36.00 | 1 |
| ITPA | 44 | 43.30 | 20 | 41.50 | 4 |
| Kephart | 28 | 26.72 | 61 | 23.70 | 37 * |
| Life-Space | 40 | 35.28 | 66 | 36.30 | 47 |
| Management | 24 | 22.82 | 88 | 22.98 | 69 |
| Peabody | 36 | 33.80 | 21 | 33.00 | 2 |
| Pitman | 32 | 30.89 | 19 | 29.87 | 8 |
| Pitman | 32 | 30.89 | 19 | 29.87 | 8 |
| Psychosit. | 40 | 34.94 | 35 | 36.05 | 36 |
| Purdue | 36 | 34.07 | 55 | 32.50 | 43 |
| Token | 24 | 21.44 | 67 | 21.36 | 75 |
| Token | 28 | 26.72 | 36 | 25.92 | 14 |
| Selecting | 28 | 25.51 | 96 | 25.77 | 72 |
| Sight | 56 | 51.36 | 11 | 50.00 | 9 |
| Staffing | 36 | 33.35 | 90 | 33.84 | 65 |
| Success | 40 | 28.20 | 105 | 27.48 | 85 |
| Success | 40 | 34.18 | 16 | 34.93 | 15 |
| Wepman | 40 | 38.15 | 13 | 39.33 | 3 |
| Words | 28 | 25.93 | 15 | 25.71 | 7 |

* Difference in means significant at the .05 level

Table IV Total Student Evaluations on and Off Campus.

| | 1 POOR | 2 FAIR | 3 GOOD | 4 EXCELLENT | 5 OUTSTANDING | N | AVERAGE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Correlation between protocol and modeling tape. | 22 | 58 | 225 | 369 | 249 | 923 | 3.83 |
| 2. Helpfulness of critiquer. | 2 | 15 | 160 | 691 | 980 | 1848 | 4.42 |
| 3. Effectiveness of protocol as a "lesson plan". | 35 | 122 | 363 | 777 | 526 | 1823 | 3.90 |
| 4. Degree of "realism" of lesson, i.e., could it realistically be applied by a teacher? | 10 | 45 | 275 | 770 | 724 | 1824 | 3.76 |
| 5. Clarity of content in tape. | 22 | 42 | 207 | 383 | 285 | 939 | 3.92 |
| 6. Technical quality of tape. | 29 | 66 | 240 | 361 | 236 | 932 | 3.76 |
| 7. Correlation between lesson and classroom instruction. | 37 | 100 | 362 | 722 | 601 | 1822 | 3.96 |
| Totals | 157 | 448 | 1832 | 4073 | 3601 | 10,111 | 3.96 |

Table V

Mean application of teaching skills by student teachers previously assigned to Microteaching or Participation.

| | MICROTEACHING n=84 $\bar{X}$ | PARTICIPATION n=86 $\bar{X}$ | t |
|---|---|---|---|
| Behavior Management Techniques: | | | |
| Establishes rapport | 3.10 | 3.06 | -.27 |
| Ignores off-task learner behavior | 3.59 | 2.80 | -7.14* |
| Verbally rewards desired learner behavior | 3.62 | 3.64 | .154 |
| Uses token reinforcement system | 2.04 | 2.23 | 1.81 |
| Behavior Management Techniques: | | | |
| Employs success programming | 1.81 | 1.89 | .60 |
| Restructures assignments when necessary | 2.13 | 2.02 | .804 |
| Expresses positive expectations | 2.79 | 2.60 | -1.34 |
| Employs humor to reduce tension | 2.06 | 2.22 | 1.23 |
| Uses non-verbal signals | 2.37 | 2.62 | .03 |
| Uses proximity control | 2.07 | 1.88 | -1.43 |
| Listens to learners without interrupting | 2.44 | 3.20 | -1.73 |
| Uses time-out procedures | 1.19 | 1.27 | 1.26 |
| Employs contingency contracting | 1.15 | 1.23 | 1.36 |
| Uses physical restraint | 1.04 | 1.19 | 3.18* |

Table V
Continued

| | MICROTEACHING n=84 $\bar{X}$ | PARTICIPATION n=86 $\bar{X}$ | t |
|---|---|---|---|
| Uses non-verbal social reinforcement | 2.86 | 2.89 | .42 |
| Assessment: | | | |
| Psychomotor development | 1.19 | 1.34 | 1.96* |
| Cognitive development | 1.79 | 1.69 | -4.24* |
| Perceptual development | 1.32 | 1.26 | -.65 |
| Adaptive behavior | 1.18 | 1.12 | -.94 |
| Social development | 1.19 | 1.28 | 1.02 |
| Remediation: | | | |
| Multisensory techniques | 1.46 | 1.42 | -.39 |
| Peabody language development kit | 1.29 | 1.28 | -.11 |
| Concept development strategy | 1.80 | 1.62 | -1.43 |
| Programmed reading (self-instruction) | 1.61 | 1.39 | -1.84 |
| Psychomotor training | 1.25 | 1.17 | -1.12 |
| Perceptual training techniques | 1.44 | 1.42 | -.21 |
| Audio-visual devices | 1.34 | 1.30 | -.39 |
| DISTAR | 1.19 | 1.11 | -1.21 |
| ITA | 1.13 | 1.01 | -2.79* |
| Structured Play | 1.54 | 1.65 | .84 |

39

* $p < .05$

DISCUSSION: Six of the differences between means were found to be significant at the .05 level, using a t-test for the difference between means. This finding would appear to indicate that there is a slight instructional advantage in having a trainee view a modeling tape prior to teaching a lesson. There are, however, other points that should be considered in explaining these findings. The first point is that the protocols issued to all students, both MT and NMT, are very explicit in their definition of teacher's tasks, representing, for some lessons, what might be called a "tight script". These lesson protocols may have been so detailed as to narrow the range of trainee scores, making it virtually impossible to obtain significant findings. On the other hand, this condition can hardly be regarded as a drawback, in as much as it is considered desirable to produce protocols that are unambiguous.

The second point is that approximately one third of the trainees served as learners for other trainees before they performed the lessons themselves. Thus, they had observed someone else's performance. While this observation may not have been as effective as viewing the "expert" in the model tape it must be assumed to have influenced the trainees' performance.

The third point is that, since there were 36 different critiquers rating trainees during the project it is entirely possible, and in fact probable, that differences among raters could obliterate differences among trainees. A brief interrater reliability study was conducted which indicated that raters were able to identify the presence or absence of specific behaviors. Due to the diversity of lessons and small numbers of trainees performing each lesson, it was not possible to collect enough data on any one rating form to reach further conclusions.

Finally, virtually all the raters were aware of the MT or NMT group assignment of the trainees. This awareness may have introduced a bias factor of unknown effect.

II. Student Evaluation of Microteaching Experience

Each trainee, after completing a Microteaching lesson, was asked to rate the experience with regard to seven variables associated with Microteaching procedures. The rating instrument, developed by the Clinic staff, consisted of seven variables, each of which could be rated on a five point scale. This information was used by the Clinic for feedback upon which modification might be based. It should be noted that trainees in the NMT group did not rate those variables dealing with modeling tapes; consequently, items 1, 5, and 6 were rated only by trainees who viewed the modeling tape prior to teaching their micro-lesson.

It seemed appropriate to study the reactions of the trainees to each lesson, to each experimental condition, and to each location. Such analysis was made using Student's t-test on each pair of circumstances. The number of significant results did not differ greatly from that expected by chance. The overall ratings seem more informative. These are reported in Table IV. It should be noted that "Helpfulness of Critiquer" averaged 4.42 (4=Excellent, 5=Outstanding) and that all averages exceeded 3.75.

III. Teaching Behaviors of Student Teachers

Observation of student-teachers by clinic staff began in the Fall of 1972 and continued through the Winter of 1974. Clinic personnel observed

for one-hour sessions to determine the frequency with which student-teachers manifested the teaching skills encompassed in the core course and Microteaching. During the first two Quarters an attempt was made to observe each trainee four times. This proved unworkable so the number of observations was decreased to two per Quarter. The frequencies of behaviors exhibited were categorized as follows;

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Never | (frequency = 0) |
| 2. | Rarely | (frequency = 1) |
| 3. | Occasionally | (frequency = 2) |
| 4. | Regularly | (frequency = 3-4) |
| 5. | Often | (frequency = 5 or more) |

The purpose of this observation phase was to compare the relative frequency of the application of teaching skills by student-teachers who did and did not have Microteaching.

At the end of the Quarter, student-teachers who had been observed were identified as having been Microteachers or participants. The observers, as they recorded their observations, were not informed of the group assignment of the student teachers.

RESULTS: The results of the observation of student-teachers are reported in Table V. For convenience, results are reported in the form of mean ratings over all observations. For example, a mean of 1 signifies that a teaching skill was never used; a mean of 5 signifies that a skill was frequently used.

DISCUSSION: Five of the difference in means were significant. Three of these appear to be the result of the particular circumstances prevailing in the schools in which the student-teachers had been placed. The two differences with the largest t's could logically be explained by the

experimental conditions. Those student-teachers in the Microteaching group had been given a lesson in "Ignoring student off task behavior," and could be expected to ignore more behavior hence relying less on physical restraint.

What was surprising was the remarkably low frequency with which student-teachers applied the teaching skills which had been employed in core courses. The application of some skills such as DISTAR and ITA, was of course a function of whether or not the cooperating school used a particular program. On the other hand, many of the skills that are of general applicabiliy were seldom applied. One might expect that these skills would have been far more frequently applied in the teaching of special education students. The question arises -- Why were they not used by student-teachers?

The answer may be in the fact that the teaching behavior of student-teachers is more a function of the teaching style and classroom climate created by the cooperating teacher than of the student-teacher's previous training. This observation was consistently made by Clinic observers.

IV. Opinionnaire Survey of Former Microteaching trainees (See attached)

In April of 1974 opinionnaires were sent to all former Microteaching trainees for whom current addresses were available. This included 231 persons. Some individuals were still completing course work or student-teaching at the time. However, the majority were actively engaged in teaching. One hundred-sixty-five responses were received. These responses are tabulated in Table VI as percentages of

total responses falling in each category. For the sake of clarity, the responses to question #1 are compressed into two categories rather than the original four. Similarly, in question #5 the responses have been categorized as AGREE or DISAGREE rather than the original four categories. The free form responses to questions #6, #7 and #8 were analyzed using content analysis procedures and are reported as percentages of the total number of responses. Since many people gave more than one response, the sum of the percentages is greater than 100.

It was interesting to note that among the improvements suggested for Microteaching 34% dealt with improving the modeling tapes and written protocols, and 23% with the relationship of Microteaching and participation.

V. Field Testing of Modules.

Samples of preliminary modules were demonstrated at the 1973 Council for Exceptional Children Convention in Dallas, Texas for the purpose of locating colleges and universities willing to field test the material. Contact was established with 54 institutions. Further communication resulted in selection of four institutions, Ohio State University, Edinborough (Pennsylvania) State College, Glassboro (New Jersey) State College, and Appalachian State College at Boone, North Carolina. A responsible member of each institution's Special Education Department signed a contract agreeing to test and return the modules. After the institutions had selected the modules they desired to use, the Coordinator visited each institution during the Fall of 1973 and conducted orientation sessions for the faculty members. The Coordinator described

and demonstrated the modules and explained the Microteaching procedures. Periodic telephone calls were made to the institutions during the semester in which the modules were tested.

RESULTS: Insufficient statistical data was returned from this testing to be reported. Four faculty members returned a Field Testing Form distributed with the modules. Of these, one who had made extensive use of the modules following the directions commented, "I want to unequivocally state that you are on the right track. The modules were most useful to me. I have planned to make certain modules an integral portion of two undergraduate courses in Learning Disabilities..." Another professor felt that the learning involved was not commensurate with the time and trouble in their utilization. A professor who used the protocols and tapes for classroom demonstration purposes called the modules "a good alternative" to his present instructional procedures. The fourth person declined to comment because of insufficient use of the materials.

Table VI Opinionnaire

Question #1:

We are seeking your response concerning the relevance of the nineteen Micro-lessons to your present teaching and/or student teaching experience. Using Columns 1 through 5 of the Chart #1, evaluate each of the Micro-lessons relative to their frequency of use in your teaching position.

Question #2:

Using column 6, Chart #1, check those methods which you would apply in your classroom, if the necessary materials were available.

Question #3:

Using Column 7, Chart #1, select the three Micro-lessons most relevant to your present teaching method.

Question #4:

Using Column 8, Chart #1 select the three Micro-lessons least relevant to your present teaching method.

Table VI
(continued)

| | Question #1 | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | # of responses | Frequently to Occasionally | Seldom to Never | Non-Applicable | Question #2 | Question #3 | Question #4 |
| A. Barsch Movigenics | 135 | 28% | 53% | 19% | 22% | 4% | 28% |
| B. Selecting Reinforcers | 137 | 76% | 18% | 6% | 47% | 16% | 4% |
| C. Token Reinforcement | 135 | 74% | 20% | 6% | 44% | 23% | 4% |
| D. Contingency Contracting | 132 | 57% | 32% | 8% | 42% | 20% | 7% |
| E. Cruickshank Auditory Discrimination | 130 | 43% | 45% | 12% | 32% | 4% | 7% |
| F. Distar Reading | 134 | 27% | 51% | 22% | 28% | 5% | 21% |
| G. Experiential Language | 124 | 43% | 42% | 15% | 28% | 6% | 8% |
| H. Fernald Hand-Kinesthetic Method | 127 | 52% | 39% | 10% | 38% | 8% | 8% |
| I. Frostig Test of Visual Perception | 129 | 60% | 29% | 11% | 42% | 13% | 2% |
| J. Gillingham-Stillman Phonic Approach | 115 | 30% | 56% | 14% | 24% | 4% | 18% |
| K. Management of Aggression | 130 | 68% | 21% | 11% | 34% | 18% | 9% |
| L. Ignoring and Reinforcing | 135 | 85% | 9% | 6% | 43% | 29% | 3% |
| M. Peabody Language Development | 132 | 61% | 29% | 10% | 42% | 19% | 2% |
| N. Pitman Initial Teaching Alphabet | 128 | 22% | 54% | 24% | 15% | 3% | 34% |
| O. Purdue Chalkboard Survey | 130 | 32% | 47% | 21% | 22% | 1% | 15% |
| P. Success Programming | 133 | 64% | 27% | 9% | 35% | 22% | 4% |
| Q. Laterality-Teaching Left and Right | 129 | 55% | 33% | 12% | 33% | 5% | 5% |
| R. Wepman Auditory Discrimination Test | 131 | 50% | 35% | 15% | 40% | 5% | 3% |
| S. Kephart Pegboard Tasks | 134 | 41% | 41% | 18% | 38% | 4% | 7% |

Question #5:

| Please express your opinion on each of the following statements. | AGREE | DISAGREE | # of responses |
|---|---|---|---|
| A. Microteaching is a valuable part of the Special Education teacher preparation program. | 78% | 22% | 165 |
| B. Microteaching should be required of all Special Education students. | 57% | 43% | 161 |
| C. Microteaching is not relevant to actual classroom teaching. | 25% | 75% | 149 |
| D. The techniques learned in Microteaching generalize to other teaching situations. | 81% | 19% | 165 |
| E. Microlessons correspond well with the Special Education course content. | 78% | 22% | 165 |
| F. Microlessons are helpful in clarifying material discussed in class. | 71% | 19% | 165 |
| G. Microteaching should be a requirement for completion of all basic Special Education courses. | 42% | 58% | 165 |
| H. Microteaching should be a separate course of study. | 51% | 49% | 155 |
| I. Microteaching requires one hour of preparation per week. | 65% | 35% | 154 |
| J. Microteaching requires two hours of preparation per week. | 28% | 72% | 161 |
| K. Microteaching acquaints students with methods and materials not presented in class. | 82% | 18% | 163 |
| L. Microteaching is a non-threatening learning experience. | 67% | 33% | 165 |
| M. Microteaching is a valuable part of a teacher's preparation in behavior management techniques. | 65% | 35% | 163 |
| N. The Microteaching Clinic is operated very efficiently. | 68% | 32% | 161 |

Question #5:
(continued)

| | AGREE | DISAGREE | # of responses |
|---|---|---|---|
| O. The Microteaching protocols are precise and well organized. | 71% | 29% | 159 |
| P. The model tapes demonstrate and clarify the microlessons. | 81% | 19% | 131 |
| Q. The critiquing is consistent, constructive, and helpful. | 82% | 18% | 152 |
| R. The facilities at the Microteaching Clinic are adequate. | 82% | 18% | 161 |

Question #6 and #7

6. What are the advantages of Microteaching?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| A. | Microteaching presents new materials, methods and techniques. | 59% |
| B. | Microteaching is realistic and relates to actual school experiences. | 58% |
| C. | Microteaching is helpful for viewing self-behavior. | 41% |
| D. | Microteaching clarifies the use of various materials, testing instruments, techniques, etc. | 26% |
| E. | Microteaching critiquers are helpful. | 19% |
| F. | Microteaching is not threatening. | 10% |
| G. | Microteaching protocols are good reference materials. | 9% |
| H. | Microteaching off-campus with children is especially helpful. | 5% |
| I. | Others. | 5% |

7. What are the disadvantages of Microteaching?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| A. | Microteaching is time consuming and not worth the time spent in preparing and traveling. | 50% |
| B. | Microteaching is an artificial and unrealistic situation for trainees. | 39% |
| C. | Microteaching has no contact with children. | 23% |
| D. | Microteaching critiquers are often inconsistent, inexperienced and incompetent. | 23% |
| E. | Microteaching tapes and protocols need improvement. | 22% |
| F. | Microteaching does not correspond with class work. | 17% |
| G. | Microteaching tapes were not shown to all trainees. | 17% |
| H. | Microteaching scheduling was not very flexible. | 9% |
| I. | Others. | 20% |

Question #8

8. What suggestions do you have for improving Microteaching?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| A. | Microteaching should be performed with children. | 26% |
| B. | Microteaching and participation should be alternated. | 23% |
| C. | Microteaching protocols should be improved to correspond with the checklist and the Special Education course. | 18% |
| D. | Microteaching tapes need to be more adequately prepared and should be shown to everyone. | 16% |
| E. | Microteaching should be taken more seriously by the Microteaching staff and by the trainees. | 11% |
| F. | Microteaching should be less time consuming. | 10% |
| G. | Microteaching needs more organization in the lab. | 8% |
| H. | Microteaching should be offered as a course. | 8% |
| I. | Microteaching protocols should be passed out as reference materials to keep. | 7% |
| J. | Microteaching critiquers should be more experienced and rotated with each lesson performed. | 6% |
| K. | Microteaching should be discontinued for graduates and teachers. | 6% |
| L. | Microteaching scheduling should be more flexible. | 5% |
| M. | Microteaching should provide some choice of lessons. | 4% |
| N. | Microteaching should include more lessons for the Junior and Senior High School levels of instruction. | 3% |
| O. | Others. | 8% |

## References

Allen, D. and Ryan, K., Microteaching. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing, 1969.

Johnson, J.A., A National Survey of Student Teaching Programs. Final Report, Cooperative Research Project No. 6-8182, U.S.O.E. Northern Illinois University, 1968.